

Norfolk Tallow Co. Norfolk, Va. Notalco Extra Quality Meat Scraps * * *
Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 55% * * * Phos. Acid. Max. 10%."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that meat scraps deficient in protein had been substituted in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the labels bore statements, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein Min. 45%," or "Protein Min. 55%," as the case might be, which were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On March 16, 1927, the Norfolk Tallow Co., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be reworked and relabeled to contain the amount of protein in accordance with the guarantee.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15091. Adulteration of tomato puree. U. S. v. 1,500 Cases of Tomato Puree. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 20957. I. S. Nos. 6691-x, 6692-x, 6693-x. S. No. E-5213.)

On March 25, 1926, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1,500 cases of tomato puree, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Tampa, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Cates Canning Co., from Cates, Ind., in various consignments, on or about October 5, 10, and 24, 1925, respectively, and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 3, 1927, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15092. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. v. 300 Boxes of Oranges. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21852. I. S. No. 3863-x. S. No. C-5445.)

On March 24, 1927, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 300 boxes of oranges, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Beaumont, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by R. W. Burch, Plant City, Fla., on or about March 16, 1927, and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "R. W. Burch Plant City, Fla. Oranges Puritan Grapefruit."

Examination of the article by this department showed that it consisted in whole or in part of frost-damaged fruit.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On March 30, 1927, the Stedman Fruit Co., Beaumont, Tex., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the material allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond, conditioned in part that it be repacked and reassorted under the supervision of this department, and the adulterated or damaged oranges destroyed.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15093. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of preserves. U. S. v. 19 Cases of Strawberry Preserves, et al. Decree entered adjudging products misbranded and ordering their release under bond. (F. & D. No. 21053. I. S. Nos. 12252-x, 12253-x, 12254-x, 12255-x. S. No. C-5085.)

On or about May 29, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure